UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,605	09/27/2004	Tony Verbeuren	SERVIER 435 PCT	2292

25666 7590 02/20/2009

THE FIRM OF HUESCHEN AND SAGE
SEVENTH FLOOR, KALAMAZOO BUILDING
107 WEST MICHIGAN AVENUE
KALAMAZOO, MI 49007

EXAMINER	
JAVANMARD, SAHAR	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/20/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/509,605	VERBEUREN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SAHAR JAVANMARD	1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 July 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *9-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *16* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *9-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

This Office Action is in response to applicant's arguments filed on 07/14/2008. Claim(s) 9-16 are pending. Claim(s) 16 is withdrawn. Claim(s) 9-15 are examined herein.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the 103(a) rejection of claims 9-15 as being unpatentable over Lavielle (US Patent No. 5,472,979) in view of Helgason (IEEE, 2000) has been fully considered but is not persuasive. Applicant contends that the disclosure of Helgason only exhibits synergistic interaction between the two drugs (aspirin and clopidogrel) when epinephrine is the aggregation agonist however when adenosine diphosphate is used, both positive and negative results are observed. Examiner respectfully notes that Helgason was employed to demonstrate that two agents that are both inhibitors of platelet aggregation may be combined to form a pharmaceutical composition. "It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose ....[T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art.', *In re Kerkhoven*, 626 F.2d 846, 850,205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980).

It was not the intent of the Examiner to demonstrate any sort of synergy between the two agents or another third agent. The reason or motivation to modify a reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve a different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. While there must be motivation to make the claimed invention, there is no requirement that the prior art provide the same reason as the applicant to make the claimed invention.

Furthermore, Applicant is arguing that the combination of aspirin and the compound of formula I demonstrate a synergistic effect. Examiner respectfully notes that this is not commensurate in scope of the claims. Applicant has demonstrated synergism at only one dose wherein aspirin is at 0.1mg/kg and the compound of formula I at 1mg/kg. Applicant's contention that synergism has been demonstrated at all doses is not enabled by the specification.

The 103(a) rejection is hereby maintained for reasons of record and is restated below for Applicant's convenience.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lavielle (US Patent No. 5,472,979) in view of Helgason (IEEE, 2000).

Lavielle teaches compounds of formula I, namely compound S 18886 and its sodium salt (see examples 1 and 7). Lavielle further teaches that these compounds are capable of inhibiting platelet aggregation (column 10, lines 43-45). The compounds may also be combined with one or more inert, non-toxic excipients or vehicles (column 10, lines 55-58).

Lavielle teaches a dosage regimen for S18886 ranging from 10-200 mg (column 11, lines 1-3).

Lavielle does not teach combining S18886 with aspirin. Further, Lavielle does not teach specifically the R optical isomer of S18886.

Helgason teaches a combination therapy consisting of aspirin and clopidogrel as a treatment regimen for the inhibition of platelet aggregation (page 215, column 1, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed the platelet aggregate inhibitor, S18886, as taught by Lavielle and combined it with aspirin. The motivation, provided by Helgason, teaches a combination therapy regimen with aspirin and clopidogrel (both inhibitors of platelet aggregation) as a method of inhibiting platelet aggregation. Thus one would expect with a reasonable degree of success that combining S18886 with aspirin would also be effective because S1886 is also an inhibitor of platelet aggregation. "It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose ....[T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art.', *In re Kerkhoven*, 626 F.2d 846, 850,205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980).

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed S18886 as taught by Lavielle and used the R isomer. The expectation with regard to enantiomers is that activities as they pertain to living systems are expected to be different. *In re Adamson*, 275 F.2d 952, 125 PS.P.Q. 233 (C.C.P.A. 1960). The fundamentals of optical activity and stereoisomerism are well known to persons having ordinary skill in the art. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have known how to resolve the racemic mixture and would have been

motivated to do so with the reasonable expectation of achieving enantiomers having substantially different pharmacological activity. It appears as though applicant has determined experimentally what a person of ordinary skill in the art would have expected, namely, that the racemic mixture of the prior art may be separate (R) and (S) enantiomers possessing substantial different pharmacological activity. This is an expected result. It is well established that expected beneficial results are evidence of obviousness of a claimed invention just as unexpected beneficial results are evidence of unobviousness. *In re Skoll*, 523 F. 2d 1392, 187 U.S.P.Q. 481 (C.C.P.A. 1975); *In re Skoner*, 517 F. 2d 947, 186 U.S.P.Q. 80 (C.C.P.A. 1975); *In re Gershon*, 372 F. 2d 535, 152 U.S.P.Q. 602 (C.C.P.A. 1967);

A pure optical isomer is not patentable over the racemic mixture unless it possesses properties not possessed by the racemic mixture. *In re Anthony*, 414 F.2d 1383, 162 U.S.P.Q. 594 (C.C.P.A. 1969).

Conclusion

Claims 9-15 are not allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SAHAR JAVANMARD whose telephone number is (571) 270-3280. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM-5 PM MON-FRI (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

/S. J./

Examiner, Art Unit 1617

/SREENI PADMANABHAN/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1617